REMARKS

Claims 1-23 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 21-23 are amended to more clearly define the invention. Claims 1, 11, and 19 are independent.

These amendments are made only to more particularly point out the invention for the Examiner and not for narrowing the scope of the claims or for any reason related to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Applicant also notes that, notwithstanding any claim amendments herein or later during prosecution, Applicant's intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements.

Claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the Maruyama reference. Claims 5-6, 15-16, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Maruyama reference in view of the LaGrotta et al. reference. Claims 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Maruyama reference in view of the Orimo et al. reference.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE CLAIMED INVENTION

An exemplary embodiment of the claimed invention as defined by, for example, independent claim 1, is directed to a portable radio telephone that includes a radio section for receiving an input radio signal and/or transmitting an output radio signal, a power supply controller for controlling a supply of electric power to the radio section responsive to reception of a power-off signal, the power-off signal being transmitted from a power-off signal transmitter provided in a prohibited area where use of a portable radio telephone is prohibited, and a power-off signal sensor for sensing reception of the power-off signal to

notify the power supply controller of reception of the power-off signal. When the power-off signal sensor senses reception of the power-off signal, the power supply controller stops the supply of electric power to the radio section while keeping additional built-in functions, other than a communication function, operable. When the power-off signal sensor does not sense reception of the power-off signal, the power supply controller continues the supply of electric power to the radio section.

Conventional portable telephones may include a power supply that cuts-off the supply of power upon receipt of a power-off signal. However, these conventional portable telephones turn off the power to the entire telephone. While these conventional portable telephones obtain the desired effect of cutting-off power from a radio transceiver and/or a sound device, these conventional telephones do not allow a user to access and/or use other devices and/or functions that are included with the portable telephone.

Other conventional portable telephones may include a communication stop key which cuts-off the power supply to the radio transceiver in response to a user's operation of the stop key. These telephones are advantageous over the above-described conventional telephones in that they only cut-off power to those circuits that provide a communication function and, therefore, allow the user to access and/or use non-communication functions. However, these conventional portable telephones do not automatically cut-off power to the communication functions.

In stark contrast, the present invention provides a power supply controller that stops the supply of electric power to the radio section while keeping additional built-in functions, other than a communication function, operable. In this manner, the power is automatically cut-off from the radio section while maintaining power to a device that does not have

communications functions (page 4, lines 18-24).

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. The Maruyama reference

Regarding the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, and 17-20, the Examiner alleges that the Maruyama reference teaches the claimed invention. Applicant submits, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention which are neither taught nor suggested by the Maruyama reference.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including: 1) a power supply controller that stops a supply of electric power to a radio section while keeping additional built-in functions, other than a communication function, operable (claims 1 and 11); and 2) a power supply that cuts-off power to the radio section and maintains power to a device that performs functions other than a communications function in response to the power-off signal sensor sensing the power-off signal (claim 19). As explained above, these features are important for automatically cutting power off from the radio section while maintaining power to a device that performs functions other than communication functions (page 4, lines 18-24).

The Maruyama reference clearly does not teach or suggest keeping any functions, other than a communication function, operable.

Indeed, the Maruyama reference does not teach or suggest anything at all regarding functions other than communication functions.

The Examiner cites paragraphs 17 and 20-21 of the Maruyama reference in an attempt to support the Examiner's allegation that the Maruyama reference discloses "keeping

additional built-in functions other than communication function operable."

However, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, paragraphs 17 and 20-21 do not support the Examiner's allegation.

Indeed, paragraph 20 of the Maruyama reference states:

> "In the standby mode to which the call activity was forbidden, although call actuation is forbidden, necessary minimum communication facility, such as a function for receiving communication function and disable discharge code for the location registration between base stations 6, is kept effective."
>
> (Emphasis added).

In other words, paragraph 20 of the Maruyama reference very clearly explains a minimum of communication facilities are maintained operable. Communication facilities are clearly not "other than communication function" as recited by the independent claims.

Indeed, the minimum communication facilities which are described by the Maruyama reference as being maintained in an operable condition are definitely communication functions.

The Maruyama reference does not teach or suggest anything at all that is even remotely related to functions which are other than communication functions, let alone maintaining functions, which are other than communication functions, operable as recited by the independent claims.

Therefore, the Maruyama reference does not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention and the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection of claims 1-4, 7-8, 11-14, and 17-20.

B. The Maruyama reference in view of the LaGrotta et al. reference

Regarding the rejection of claims 5-6, 15-16, and 21-23, the Examiner alleges that the LaGrotta et al. reference would have been combined with the Maruyama reference to form the claimed invention. Applicant submits, however, that these references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

None of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed invention including: 1) a power supply controller that stops a supply of electric power to a radio section while keeping additional built-in functions, other than a communication function, operable (claims 1 and 11); and 2) a power supply that cuts-off power to the radio section and maintains power to a device that performs functions other than a communications function in response to the power-off signal sensor sensing the power-off signal (claim 19). These features are important for automatically cutting power off from the radio section while maintaining power to a device that performs functions other than communication functions (page 4, lines 18-24).

As explained above, the Maruyama reference clearly does not teach or suggest these features.

The LaGrotta et al. reference does not remedy the deficiencies of the Maruyama reference.

Indeed, the Examiner does not allege that the LaGrotta et al. reference remedies these deficiencies of the Maruyama reference.

The LaGrotta et al. reference discloses a method for remote power-down control of a wireless terminal. In particular, the LaGrotta et al. reference discloses sending a power-down

control signal to a wireless terminal to force the wireless terminal to power-down for a discrete interval of time. The LaGrotta et al. reference discloses that the wireless terminal remains without communications function for the discrete interval of time, but powers-up after the discrete interval of time has elapsed.

The LaGrotta et al. reference clearly does not teach or suggest keeping any functions, other than a communication function, operable.

Indeed, the LaGrotta et al. reference does not teach or suggest anything at all regarding functions other than communication functions.

Further, regarding claims 5-6 and 15-16, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, the LaGrotta et al. reference does not teach or suggest a portable telephone storing a power-off code, let alone keeping the power supply stopped if the code is present or restarting the power supply if the code is not present.

The Examiner cites col. 4, lines 4-60 and col. 5, lines 8-21 of the LaGrotta et al. reference in an attempt to support the Examiner's allegation.

Firstly, col. 4, lines 31 - 60 and col. 5, lines 8-21 of the LaGrotta et al. reference have absolutely nothing to do with a portable terminal. Rather, col. 4, lines 31 - 60 and col. 5, lines 8-21 of the LaGrotta et al. reference describes the operation of the Wireless Provider Terminal Services (WTSP), and not the portable terminal.

Secondly, col. 4, lines 4 - 30 of the LaGrotta et al. reference does not teach or suggest storing any code at all. Rather, col. 4, lines 4 - 30 of the LaGrotta et al. reference explains how the portable terminal maintaining a sleep mode until "completion of the sleep period." (Col. 4, lines 27 - 30).

Therefore, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, the LaGrotta et al. reference does not

teach or suggest a portable telephone storing a power-off code, let alone keeping the power supply stopped if the code is present or restarting the power supply if the code is not present.

Additionally, with respect to claims 21-23, contrary to the Examiner's allegations, the LaGrotta et al. reference does not teach or suggest functions other than communications functions comprise at least one of a telephone directory function and a scheduler function.

The Examiner alleges that col. 4, lines 4-30 of the LaGrotta et al. reference discloses functions other than communications functions comprise at least one of a telephone directory function and a scheduler function.

However, contrary to the Examiner's allegation, col. 4, lines 4-30 of the LaGrotta et al. reference discloses that "In a sleep mode, the pager uses only minimum battery power, only that amount of power needed to operate the timing circuits. All other circuit operations are in the off state." In other words, the LaGrotta et al. reference merely discloses maintaining operation of a timer operation and nothing else in the sleep mode.

Therefore, the LaGrotta et al. reference does not teach or suggest functions other than communications functions comprise at least one of a telephone directory function and a scheduler function.

Indeed, the LaGrotta et al. reference does not teach or suggest anything at all that is even remotely related to a telephone directory function or a scheduler function.

Further, Applicant submits that these references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, the references are directed to completely different matters and problems.

Specifically, the Maruyama reference is concerned with instability by turbulence within a radio-wave-propagation environment that may cause problems in ensuring that a

device maintains a standby-mode within a disable area ([0004] - [0006]).

In stark contrast, the LaGrotta et al. reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of missed calls to a wireless terminal (col. 1, lines 50 - 64).

One of ordinary skill in the art who was concerned with instability by turbulence within a radio-wave-propagation environment that may cause problems in ensuring that a device maintains a standby-mode within a disable area as the Maruyama reference is concerned would not have referred to the LaGrotta et al. reference, and vice-versa, because the LaGrotta et al. reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of missed calls to a wireless terminal. Thus, the references would not have been combined.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 5-6, 15-16.

C. The Maruyama reference in view of the Orimo et al. reference

Regarding the rejection of claims 9 and 10, the Examiner alleges that the Orimo et al. reference would have been combined with the Maruyama reference to form the claimed invention. Applicant submits, however, that these references would not have been combined and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

First, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to comply with the clear requirements that are set forth in the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure. In particular, the Examiner has failed to comply with the requirements of the M.P.E.P. as set forth in § 707.07(f) by failing to answer all material traversed.

"Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the examiner should, if

he or she repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it." (M.P.E.P. § 707.07(f), emphasis added).

Specifically, in the Remarks of the December 27, 2004, Amendment, Applicant traversed the Examiner's allegation that the Orimo et al. reference disclosed manually disabling/enabling the radio section by a specific key operation by a user.

In particular, Applicant explained in the December 27, 2004, Amendment that the Orimo et al. reference does not teach or suggest cutting off power to a radio section at all, let alone cutting off power to a radio section while maintaining power delivery to a device that performs functions other than communications function.

Rather, the Orimo et al. reference merely discloses providing a portable telephone having a selection of modes, such as, a meeting mode, a theater mode, and a darkness mode. Each mode has a different set of functions turned on or off.

None of the modes that are disclosed by the Orimo et al. reference cuts power off from a radio section, let alone cuts power off from a radio section while maintaining power delivery to a non-communication function device.

Rather, the Orimo et al. reference discloses modes that always maintain power to a radio section and only discloses turning on or off a display, a vibrator, a ringer, and a key tone as well as how calls are to be transferred and which calls will be accepted depending upon the origination of the call. Thus, the Orimo et al. reference clearly teaches away from a power supply controller that stops supply of electric power to a radio section while keeping additional built-in functions, other than a communication function, operable.

The Examiner has clearly failed to address this traversal.

Further, none of the applied references teaches or suggests the features of the claimed

invention including: 1) a power supply controller that stops a supply of electric power to a radio section while keeping additional built-in functions, other than a communication function, operable (claims 1 and 11); and 2) a power supply that cuts-off power to the radio section and maintains power to a device that performs functions other than a communications function in response to the power-off signal sensor sensing the power-off signal (claim 19). These features are important for automatically cutting power off from the radio section while maintaining power to a device that performs functions other than communication functions (page 4, lines 18-24).

As explained above, the Maruyama reference clearly does not teach or suggest these features.

The Orimo et al. reference does not remedy the deficiencies of the Maruyama reference.

Indeed, the Examiner does not allege that the Orimo et al. reference remedies these deficiencies of the Maruyama reference.

Rather, as explained above, the Orimo et al. reference discloses modes that always maintain power to a radio section and only discloses turning on or off a display, a vibrator, a ringer, and a key tone as well as how calls are to be transferred and which calls will be accepted depending upon the origination of the call. Thus, the Orimo et al. reference clearly teaches away from a power supply controller that stops supply of electric power to a radio section while keeping additional built-in functions, other than a communication function, operable.

Therefore, the Orimo et al. reference clearly does not teach or suggest keeping any functions, other than a communication function, operable.

Indeed, the Orimo et al. reference does not teach or suggest anything at all regarding functions other than communication functions.

Further, Applicant submits that these references would not have been combined as alleged by the Examiner. Indeed, the references are directed to completely different matters and problems.

Specifically, the Maruyama reference is concerned with instability by turbulence within a radio-wave-propagation environment that may cause problems in ensuring that a device maintains a standby-mode within a disable area ([0004] - [0006]).

In stark contrast, the Orimo et al. reference is specifically directed to addressing the problem of a complicated arranging of a portable telephone during, for example, a meeting and the problem of "un-arranging" the telephone back to a normal situation. [0004].

One of ordinary skill in the art who was concerned with instability by turbulence within a radio-wave-propagation environment that may cause problems in ensuring that a device maintains a standby-mode within a disable area as the Maruyama reference is concerned would not have referred to the Orimo et al. reference, and vice-versa, because the Orimo et al. reference is concerned with the completely different and unrelated problem of a complicated arranging of a portable telephone during, for example, a meeting and the problem of "un-arranging" the telephone back to a normal situation. Thus, the references would not have been combined.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claims 9 and 10.

III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-23, all the claims presently pending in the Application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the Application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 8/9/05

James E. Howard
Registration No. 39,715

McGinn & Gibb, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254